

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed March 21, 2007. Claim 15 is allowed. Claims 1-5, 10-14 and 23-25 have been rejected and claims 3, 5, 16 and 17 have been objected to. Claims 6-9 and 18-22 have previously been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, 10, 14, 15, and 23 have been amended. Claims 3 and 5 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 26-29 have been added.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action dated March 21, 2007 are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 3 and 5 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being in improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant has canceled claims 3 and 5 without prejudice as their limitations have been incorporated into claim 1. On this basis Applicant requests that the rejections to claims 3 and 5 be withdrawn.

Claims 16-17 are objected to because of the informalities: claim 16 depends on claim 6 that has been canceled.

Applicant has amended claim 16 to depend on claim 10 and to incorporate language substantially the same as the language presented in claim 6. On this basis Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

1. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the dual mode amplifier unit" in the body of claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite a dual-mode filter and amplifier unit consistently throughout claim 1 and the claims which depend from it. On this basis Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

2. Claims 1, 10 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 23 and their respective dependent claims to recite WLAN-compatible mode consistently throughout the claims. On this basis, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-5, 10-14, 15-17 and 23-25 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and objections set forth in this office action. Claim 15 is allowed.

As previously discussed, Applicant has amended the cited claims to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. On this basis, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding allowed claim 15, Applicant notes that the amendment to claim 15 to read a "WLAN-compatible mode" is directed to consistency throughout the claims, and should not affect the previous allowance of claim 15.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the applicant submits that the claims pending in the application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 and patentably define over the prior art. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees as indicated above, any additional required fees which may be due, and charge any variance or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2207 (Attorney Docket 61140-8018.US01).

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at (650) 838-4367 in event that additional issues are raised that would prevent allowance of the pending claims and issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: May 21, 2007

By: 

Walter K. Coronel
Registration No. 56,177

For R. Michael Ananian
Registration No. 35,050

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, California 94026
(650) 838-4300